## REMARKS

**INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing remarks, claims 1-28, 30-43, 45-54, and 56-61 remain pending. Applicants respectfully assert that the claims listed on pages 2-10 of this Response distinguish over the references relied upon by the Examiner.

**REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW:**

Prior to Action taken on this Response and the Request for Continued Examination ("RCE") filed concurrently herewith, applicants' representative requests an interview with the Examiner.

**DRAWINGS:**

Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner determined the formal drawings filed on December 5, 2001 to be acceptable.

**REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-28, 30-43, 45-54, AND 56-61UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY TANABE (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,118,586):**

On page 3 of the Office action, claims 1-28, 30-43, 45-54, and 56-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tanabe, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,118,586) (hereinafter, "Tanabe"). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). As discussed in detail herein below, Tanabe does not disclose all of the elements set forth in each of claims 1-28, 30-43, 45-54, and 56-61; therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims patentably distinguish over the reference relied upon by the Examiner.

Independent claim 1 of the present application recites, in part, "An optical film comprising: an array of diffraction grating cells arranged in a matrix ..." Therefore, the optical film includes an array, or group, of diffraction grating cells arranged in a matrix.

In a non-limiting example of the present application, there is provided an optical diffusion film that can increase the ratio of emitting light to a particular area relative to incident light, or the efficiency of utilization of light, to display a bright image when compared with conventional optical films only adapted to a non-directional diffusion (scattering) by arranging an array of diffraction grating cells in a matrix. Therefore, the range (view area) of light emission may be

selected according to a diffraction effect of light. Further, since the profile, pitch, and depth of diffraction gratings of the optical diffusion film may vary on an area by area basis, a single optical diffusion film may have a plurality of functions including controlling the spreading angle of light by changing the direction of emission of light. Additionally, since the optical diffusion film comprises blazed type or binary type diffraction gratings, the ratio of converting incident light may be raised into diffracted light, e.g., the efficiency of utilization of light, to nearly 100%. Accordingly, since external light can be efficiently utilized, it is not necessary to provide the display device with an internally contained light source. Specification, page 29, line 1 to page 30, line 7.

Tanabe does not teach or suggest an optical film comprising "an array of diffraction grating cells arranged in a matrix," as recited in claim 1 of the present application. Instead, Tanabe discloses a process or method of manufacturing a single diffracting element and/or diffracting elements that does not include an optical film comprising an array of diffraction grating cells. Each of the diffracting elements having a plurality of liquid crystals are formed and *individually* separated. Tanabe, column 10, lines 63-67.

A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). MPEP 2141.03. Tanabe teaches away from at least the above-described feature of claim 1 of the present application. The present application requires that the optical film comprise an array of diffraction grating cells arranged in a matrix. Tanabe specifically discloses individually separating each of the diffracting elements filled on a transparent substrate. Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request that claim 1 of the present application patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon by the Examiner and is in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 9, 20, 30, 41, 52, and 61 each include similar claim features as those recited in independent claim 1; therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments presented above supporting the patentability of independent claim 1 are incorporated herein to support the patentability of independent claims 9, 20, 30, 41, 52, and 61.

Claims 2-8, 10-19, 21-28, 31-40, 42-43, 45-51, 53-54, 56-60 depend from independent claims 1, 9, 20, 30, 41, 52, and 61. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above that independents claim 1, 9, 20, 30, 41, 52, and 61 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully request that dependent claims 2-8, 10-19,

21-28, 31-40, 42-43, 45-51, 53-54, 56-60 also patentably distinguish over the reference relied upon by the Examiner. Moreover, dependent claims also recite features for the inventions that also are not disclosed or suggested by the cited and applied Tanabe reference.

By example only, dependent claim 2 of the present application recites, in part, " ... gratings of different grating cells contain different profiles." Therefore, each of the different grating cells of the array of diffraction grating cells that are arranged in a matrix contains a different profile. Tanabe does not teach or suggest the above-described feature recited in claim 2 of the present application. Instead, Tanabe discloses that polarization directions cross as between the going direction of light and the returning direction of light. Tanabe, column 5, lines 35-48, column 10, lines 63-67. There is no teaching or suggestion, either explicit or implicit, that gratings of different grating cells contain different profiles. Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request that claim 2 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon by the Examiner and is in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, the claims 1-28, 30-43, 45-54, and 56-61 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 22, 2005

By: David M. Pitcher

David M. Pitcher
Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501